

REMARKS

A telephone discussion between Examiner Johns and Dennis Smid (one of the applicant's undersigned attorneys) was held on June 10, 2010. The applicant and Mr. Smid wish to thank the Examiner for his time and consideration for such discussion.

Claims 2-5 and 7-18 have been canceled. Amended claims 1, 6, and 19 are in this application.

Claims 1, 6, and 19 were objected to because of an informality. In explaining this objection, the Examiner stated that "they are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.75(i)"

During the June 10 telephone discussion, the Examiner indicated that elements/features such as those of the electronic device and server of claims 1 and 6 should be indented. In response, claims 1 and 6 have been amended herein so as to indent such elements/features of claims 1 and 6. It is respectfully submitted that claim 19 satisfies 37 CFR 1.75(i). Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the above objection be withdrawn.

Further, during the June 10 telephone discussion, the Examiner suggested adding the word "programmed" after "CPU" in claims 1 and 6. Such changes have been incorporated herein.

Claims 1, 6, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,732,106 ("Okamoto").

Independent claim 1 has been amended herein in the manner discussed during the June 10 telephone discussion. Independent claims 6 and 19 have been similarly or somewhat similarly amended herein. As a result and as an example, amended claim 1 now recites in part the following:

"each of the at least two electronic devices including:

a first central processing unit (CPU) programmed:

(i) to cause the user identification information and the device identification information for the respective electronic device, and software identification information for selected software, to be sent to the server to request that the selected software be provided;

(ii) to cause the selected software provided from the server to be installed after the user identification information and the device identification information for the respective electronic device, and the software identification information for the selected software, has been sent to the server;

(iii) to cause the software identification information for the installed software, the user identification information, and the device identification information for the respective electronic device to be sent to the server so as to request that a license required to run the selected software be generated based on predetermined license generating information and be provided to the electronic device;

. . .

the server including:

a second central processing unit (CPU) programmed:

(i) to cause registration of the software identification information for the selected software in association with the user identification information and the device identification information for the respective electronic device;

(ii) to cause the selected software to be provided to the respective electronic device;

(iii) to receive the software identification information for the installed software, the user identification information, and the device identification information for the respective electronic device from the respective electronic device, after receipt thereof to determine

whether the software identification information, the user identification information, and the device identification information for the respective electronic device have been previously registered in association with each other, and to cause generation of the license when a determination result indicates that the software identification information, the user identification information, and the device identification information for the respective electronic device have been previously registered in association with each other; and

. . . ."

As discussed during the June 10 telephone discussion, it is respectfully submitted that the present application provides support for the features herein added to claim 1 (and claims 6 and 19). With regard thereto and as an example, reference is made to Steps S31, S21, S22, S32, S33, S23 and S24 of Fig. 9 and paragraphs 0059-0071 of the present application.

As also discussed during the June 10 telephone discussion, it is respectfully submitted that Okamoto as applied by the Examiner does not appear to disclose all of the above-identified features now recited in claim 1. Accordingly, it is believed that amended claim 1 is distinguishable from Okamoto as applied by the Examiner.

For reasons similar to those previously described with regard to claim 1, it is also respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 6 and 19 are also distinguishable from Okamoto as applied by the Examiner.

As it is believed that all of the objections and rejections set forth in the Official Action have been overcome, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicants' attorney at

Application No.: 10/699,984

Docket No.: SONYJP 3.0-346

(908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections and/or rejections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: June 28, 2010

Respectfully submitted,
Electronic signature: /Dennis M.
Smid, Esq./
Dennis M. Smid, Esq.
Registration No.: 34,930
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant(s)